

the executive branch of government, and to suggest his removal entails a constitutional crisis and a disruption of our whole political system.

We have all been slapped in the face by not only the President's action, but also the Starr inquisition, and we have been so busy holding our cheeks that we have not even examined the evidence and made a deliberative assessment of it. I myself have educated myself about the severity of the Articles of Impeachment, and I want to share with my colleagues and the American people some of the thoughts that I have learned.

As we all know, the Congress has been down this road only twice before in American history, and we need to wake up right now as to the severity of today's issue and what it means to the Republic and this Congress's place in U.S. history.

I asked Larry Tribe, perhaps our Nation's most renowned constitutional scholar, to describe the upcoming vote to begin, just to begin, an impeachment inquiry; and his answer, my colleagues, captures everything that I want to say today.

Professor Tribe likened a vote simply to begin the impeachment proceeding to that of breaking the glass of a fire alarm, that would trigger a mad rush and a state of emergency. He said once the glass is broken and the alarm goes off, we cannot put the pieces back together. Such an action will make it almost impossible to restore a sense of stability and order in this country. Impeachment proceedings are just like pulling a fire alarm in a crowded room; you better think before you pull, lest many people or this Nation get hurt in the process.

To be sure, if we are going to go down the road to impeachment, it must be taken with a keen sense of understanding and purpose. Otherwise, we will be blind to the consequences of our actions. And we must begin with what constitutes the ground for an impeachable offense.

Is this what Ken Starr says it is? Is this what TRENT LOTT says it is? Is this what the gentleman from Illinois (HENRY HYDE) or I should say the gentleman from Georgia (NEWT GINGRICH) says it is? Or should it be the definition of the entire Congress before we begin an inquiry into impeachment?

I like the fact that, in fact, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) has said that we should have hearings on what constitutes grounds for impeachment. That seems to be the right course to take. Yet it seems the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH) intend to proceed with an impeachment inquiry before such hearings on the working definition of what impeachment really is could even take place.

Do they want to make it up as they go along? It sure sounds as though they do. In my opinion, to make up a definition or to proceed with an inquisition

before we have had the time to understand what truly constitutes impeachment and we have a frame of reference to judge our actions against when we continue with an inquiry, constitutes sounding the fire alarm before we know there is even a fire, and it flies in the face of the due process set forth by our Constitution, which says that we need to know what to prosecute before we know whether a crime has been committed.

The reason the majority wants to vote on an impeachment inquiry next Monday, before they know what impeachment really is, is because they would never vote to initiate an inquiry once they really know what they are talking about. And once we know what is truly impeachable, then we need to ask one more question.

#### REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL TIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY) has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time is limited to 5 minutes. The Member will close.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Member should avoid reference to personal conduct of the President and reference to statements of members of the other body.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. In conclusion, once we know what impeachable offense is, then we need to ask another question. Is it the kind of offense in which the President's remaining in office is far worse for this country than what will happen to this country if we remove a President from office? We need wisdom to prevail over politics.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY) has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot entertain the request for any additional time. The gentleman's time has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FOSSELLA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CONYERS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. KINGSTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. CAPPS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCARBOROUGH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BLUMENAUER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. TALENT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### MILITARY ACTION AGAINST YUGOSLAVIA REQUIRES AUTHORITY FROM CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we heard news of horrible massacres of ethnic Albanians by Serbian forces in Kosovo: women, children, the elderly all shot in cold blood. The same reports say that these massacres may now spur NATO to take military action.

As terrible as these events are, I want to remind my colleagues that under our Constitution, Congress has the responsibility to decide whether